Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission: 2010-03-18 15:27:24

2. Agency: 011

3. Bureau: 03

4. Name of this Investment: JMD Law Enforcement Wireless Communication (LEWC)

5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: 011-03-01-03-01-1640-00

- 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2011?: Mixed Life Cycle
 - Planning
 - Full Acquisition
 - Operations and Maintenance
 - Mixed Life Cycle
 - Multi-Agency Collaboration
- 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? *
- 8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap; this description may include links to relevant information which should include relevant GAO reports, and links to relevant findings of independent audits.

The Integrated Wireless Network (IWN), allows the Department to rapidly establish and implement a minimum operational baseline to achieve its strategic goals, while allowing for increased functionality when funding permits. IWN supports the replacement and modernization of failing radio systems, correction of security deficiencies, addresses mandated technical standards (for which the Department is currently in violation), and achieves communications standards that directly support Agent Safety for the DOJ's four law enforcement agencies (ATF, DEA, FBI, USMS). The consolidated IWN approach leverages existing Agency radio sites wherever practical, while focusing on providing efficient, comparable coverage for ATF, DEA, FBI, and the USMS. All four Law Enforcement components will share a unified radio network, thus eliminating redundant coverage and duplicative radio sites. To address the increasing sophistication of criminals and terrorists, the DOJ's law enforcement missions require wireless communications with the following capabilities: Coverageflexible communications services available wherever agents need to operate. Security- voice communications must be encrypted. Reliability- communications services must always be available. Interoperability- DOJ agents must be able to communicate with agents and officers from other federal, state and local law enforcement agencies. The interoperability must be dynamic and achieved rapidly in order to account for changing environments and degree of needs of officer safety. Flexibility- communication services type depends on mission (surveillance, arrest, protective detail, task force coordination, incident response). These capabilities will support the wide range of DOJ agent missions including, but not limited to: investigative or counterintelligence surveillance operations; protective details for VIPs; fugitive or other task force arrest operations; and coordination with state and local law enforcement during an emergency scenario. In addition to IWN, the LEWC account provides the resources for DOJ Legacy Operations and Maintenance. Special Projects represent a third line-of-business supported by the LEWC account. This includes support for national events such as the Super Bowl, the Democratic and Republican National Conventions, Olympic Trials, 25 Cities Project, and unforeseen natural disasters. **Current Cost Model is being revised**.

a. Provide here the date of any approved rebaselining within the past year, the date for the most recent (or planned)alternatives analysis for this investment, and whether this investment has a risk management plan and risk register.

- 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? * a.If "yes," what was the date of this approval? *
- 10. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?
 - Name: *
 - Phone Number: *
 - Email: *
- 11. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per FAC-P/PM)? *
 - Project manager has been validated according to FAC-PMPM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.
 - Project manager qualifications according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria is under review for this investment.
 - Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/OM or DAWIA criteria.
 - Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started.
 - No project manager has yet been assigned to this investment.

12. If this investment is a financial management system, then please fill out the following as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory (FMSI):

| Financial management system name(s) | System acronym | Unique Project Identifier (UPI) number |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|--|
| * | * | * |

- a. If this investment is a financial management system AND the investment is part of the core financial system then select the primary FFMIA compliance area that this investment addresses (choose only one): *
 - computer system security requirement;
 - internal control system requirement;
 - o core financial system requirement according to FSIO standards;
 - Federal accounting standard;
 - U.S. Government Standard General Ledger at the Transaction Level;
 - this is a core financial system, but does not address a FFMIA compliance area;
 - Not a core financial system; does not need to comply with FFMIA

Section B: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

| Table 1: SUMMARY OF FUNDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|-------|--|--|
| | PY1 and earlier | PY 2009 | CY 2010 | BY 2011 | BY+1 2012 | BY+2 2013 | BY+3 2014 | BY+4 and beyond | Total | | |
| Planning: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | |
| Acquisition: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | |
| Subtotal Planning & Acquisition: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | |
| Operations & Maintenance : | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | |
| Disposition Costs (optional): | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | |
| SUBTOTAL: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | |
| | | Government I | FTE Costs sh | ould not be ir | ncluded in the | amounts pro | ovided above. | | | | |
| Government FTE Costs | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | |
| Number of FTE represented by Costs: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | |
| TOTAL(inclu ding FTE costs) | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | |

2. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY 2010 President's Budget request, briefly explain those changes:

*

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1.

| | Table 1: Contracts/Task Orders Table | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Contract or Task Order Number | Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16) | Has the contr act been awar ded (Y/N) | If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date? | Start date of Contract/T ask Order | End date of Contract/T ask Order | Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (M) | Is this an Inter agen cy Acqu isitio n? (Y/N) | Is it perfo rman ce base d? (Y/N) | Com petiti vely awar ded? (Y/N) | What, if any, alternativ e financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A) | Is EVM in the contr act? (Y/N) | |
| DJJ06C1410 | FFP, T&M, CPFF, CPIF, CPAF | Y | 2006-06-08 | 2006-06-08 | 2021-05-31 | \$10,000.0 | * | * | * | * | * | |
| GS23F0005K | T&M | Υ | 2004-11-09 | 2004-11-09 | 2010-09-30 | \$33.5 | * | * | * | * | * | |
| DJJ4100002 | CPFF | Υ | 2007-08-30 | 2007-08-30 | 2010-10-10 | \$18.5 | * | * | * | * | * | |
| DJJ4100003 | CPFF | Υ | 2009-08-07 | 2009-08-07 | 2010-06-06 | \$4.3 | * | * | * | * | * | |
| DJJ14100004 | CPFF | Υ | 2009-09-29 | 2009-09-29 | 2010-10-29 | \$23.6 | * | * | * | * | * | |

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

3. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? *

a.If "yes," what is the date? *

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

| Table 1: Performance Information Table | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results | | | |
| 2007 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | Number of Top 25 Cities with Interoperable Solution Deployed | 23 | 24 | 24 | | | |
| 2007 | Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice | * | * | Cost avoidance by procuring in bulk quantities | N/A | \$1.3 million | \$1.331 million | | | |
| 2007 | Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice | * | * | % USMS districts Consolidated onto FBI systems | 90% | 95% | 93% | | | |
| 2007 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | % Justice units converted to IWN Narrowband compliant units | 48% portable; 62% mobile | 52% portable; 64% mobile | 52% portable; 64% mobile | | | |
| 2008 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | Number of Top 25 Cities with Interoperable Solution Deployed | 24 | 25 | 26 | | | |
| 2008 | Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice | * | * | Cost avoidance by procuring in bulk quantities | 10% | 10% discount of total contract purchase price | total contract | | | |
| 2009 | Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice | * | * | Cost avoidance by procuring in bulk quantities | 10% | 10% discount of total contract purchase price | 7% | | | |
| 2010 | Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice | * | * | Cost avoidance by procuring in bulk quantities | 10% | 10% discount of total contract purchase price | TBD | | | |
| 2011 | Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice | * | * | Cost avoidance by procuring in bulk quantities | 10% | 10% discount of total contract purchase price | TBD | | | |
| 2012 | Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice | * | * | Cost avoidance by procuring in bulk quantities | 10% | 10% discount of total contract purchase price | TBD | | | |
| 2008 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the | * | * | % USMS Districts consolidated onto FBI systems | 95% | 100% | 95% | | | |

| | | Tab | le 1: Performand | ce Information Ta | ble | | |
|-------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
| | American People | | | | | | |
| 2008 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | % Justice units converted to IWN Narrowband compliant units | 52% portable; 64% mobile | 56% portable; 68% mobile | 56% portable; 68% mobile |
| 2009 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | Number of Top 25 Cities with Interoperable Solution Deployed | 26 | 26 | 26 |
| 2009 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | % USMS Districts consolidated onto FBI system | 95% | 97% | 96% |
| 2009 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | % Justice units converted to IWN Narrowband compliant units | 56%portable; 68% mobile | 65% portable; 77% mobile | 78% portable; 77% mobile |
| 2010 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | Number of Top 25 Cities iwth Interoperabile Solution Deployed | 26 | 26 | TBD |
| 2010 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | % USMS Districts consolidated onto FBI system | 100% | 100% | TBD |
| 2010 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | % Narrow Band Conversion | 30% | 31% | TBD |
| 2010 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the | * | * | % AES Compliant | 20% | 21% | TBD |

| Table 1: Performance Information Table | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|-------------------------|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results | | | |
| | American People | | | | | | | | | |
| 2011 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | % Narrowband Conversion | 31% | 37% | TBD | | | |
| 2011 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | % AES Compliant | 21% | 27% | TBD | | | |
| 2012 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | % Narrowband conversion | 37% | 66% | TBD | | | |
| 2012 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | % AES compliant | 27% | 56% | TBD | | | |
| 2010 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | % Justice units converted to Narrowband compliant units | 65% portable; 77% mobile | 70% portable; 82% mobile | TBD | | | |
| 2011 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | * | % Justice Units converted to Narrowband compliant units | 70% portable; 82% mobile | 90% portable; 100% mobile | TBD | | | |
| 2012 | Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws, and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People | * | • | % Justice Units converted to Narrowband compliant units | 90% portable; 100% modbile | 95% portable; 100% mobile | TBD | | | |

Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information

Section A: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

| | 1. Comp | arison of Actua | al Work Comple | eted and Actua | l Costs to Curi | rent Approved I | Baseline | |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Description of Milestones | Planned Cost (\$M) | Actual Cost (\$M) | Planned Start Date | Actual Start Date | Planned Completion Date | Actual Completion Date | Planned Percent Complete | Actual Percent Complete |
| Wireless Management PMO | \$1.7 | \$1.2 | 2007-10-01 | 2007-10-01 | 2010-09-29 | | 82.00% | 70.00% |
| Oregon I-5 | \$5.2 | \$4.5 | 2005-11-15 | 2005-11-15 | 2010-09-29 | | 86.00% | 85.00% |
| 7.x Upgrade | \$5.0 | \$3.8 | 2009-09-15 | 2009-08-25 | 2011-06-14 | | 51.00% | 76.00% |
| Portland | \$5.2 | \$4.5 | 2004-07-19 | 2007-01-30 | 2010-09-29 | | 99.00% | 87.00% |
| Oregon Coast | \$1.5 | \$1.3 | 2005-03-01 | 2005-03-01 | 2010-09-29 | | 85.00% | 84.00% |
| IWN PM | \$51.0 | \$21.8 | 2008-10-01 | 2008-10-01 | 2015-03-31 | | 27.00% | 40.00% |
| IWN Region 5 | * | * | 2012-10-01 | | 2013-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| IWN Region 4 | * | * | 2011-10-01 | | 2013-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| National Capital Region Design | \$4.6 | \$3.7 | 2009-09-29 | 2008-12-01 | 2011-01-27 | | 77.00% | 80.00% |
| IWN Region 1 Remaining | * | * | 2008-12-01 | | 2011-05-04 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| IWN Region 6 | * | * | 2012-10-01 | | 2013-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| IWN Region 2 | * | * | 2010-10-01 | | 2012-09-28 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| IWN San Diego (Beta) | \$0.9 | \$0.6 | 2007-10-01 | 2007-10-01 | 2010-09-29 | | 92.00% | 64.00% |
| Western Washington | \$25.1 | \$22.6 | 2003-04-01 | 2007-05-21 | 2010-09-29 | | 96.00% | 90.00% |
| IWN Region 3 | * | * | 2011-10-03 | | 2013-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| NW Survivability | \$5.5 | \$4.7 | 2005-10-03 | 2008-09-01 | 2010-09-29 | | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| Eastern Washington | \$15.7 | \$15.4 | 2005-01-04 | 2005-04-01 | 2010-09-29 | | 99.00% | 99.00% |
| National Capital Region Deployment | \$22.8 | \$21.4 | 2009-09-29 | 2009-09-29 | 2010-10-29 | | 83.00% | 94.00% |
| IWN National Elements | * | * | 2010-06-28 | | 2015-03-31 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |

^{* -} Indicates data is redacted.